

ALEXANDER G. CALFO (SBN 152891)  
acalfo@kslaw.com

JULIA E. ROMANO (SBN 260857)  
jromano@kslaw.com

**KING & SPALDING LLP**

633 West Fifth Street

Suite 1600

Los Angeles, CA 90071

Telephone: +1 213 443 4355

Facsimile: +1 213 443 4310

SHANNON E. BEAMER (SBN 331289)

sebeamer@venable.com

**VENABLE LLP**

2049 Century Park East, Suite 2300

Los Angeles, CA 90067

Telephone: +1 310 229 9682

Facsimile: +1 310 229 9901

Attorneys for Defendants

MERCK & CO., INC.; MERCK SHARP  
& DOHME CORP.<sup>1</sup>; ORGANON & CO.;  
and ORGANON LLC

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

KAROLINA CHRISTENSEN, an individual,

Plaintiff,

v.

MERCK & CO., INC., a New Jersey  
Corporation; MERCK SHARP & DOHME  
CORP., a New Jersey Corporation;  
ORGANON & CO., a Delaware Corporation;  
ORGANON LLC, a Delaware Limited  
Liability Company; and DOES 1-10,  
Inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:22-cv-00868-DAD-EPG

**JOINT STIPULATION AND ORDER TO  
EXTEND DEFENDANTS MERCK & CO.,  
INC., MERCK SHARP & DOHME CORP.,  
ORGANON & CO., AND ORGANON  
LLC'S TIME TO RESPOND TO  
PLAINTIFF'S INITIAL COMPLAINT  
PURSUANT TO LOCAL RULE 144**

<sup>1</sup> Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp. is now known as Merck Sharp & Dohme LLC.

1 Plaintiff Karolina Christensen (“Plaintiff”) and Defendants Merck & Co., Inc., Merck Sharp  
2 & Dohme Corp., Organon & Co., and Organon LLC (collectively, “Defendants”), by and through the  
3 undersigned counsel, hereby submit this Stipulation pursuant to Local Rule 144 as follows:

4 1. WHEREAS Plaintiff filed this civil action against Defendants in the Superior Court of  
5 the State of California for the County of Plumas on March 4, 2022;

6 2. WHEREAS, Plaintiff served Defendants with a copy of the Summons and Complaint  
7 on April 20, 2022;

8 3. WHEREAS Defendants removed the case to this Court on May 20, 2022 pursuant to  
9 its Notice of Removal and Removal of Action within 30 days of service pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1446  
10 (see Dkt. No. 1);

11 4. WHEREAS, on May 26, 2022, the Parties filed a joint stipulation to extend  
12 Defendants’ time to respond to Plaintiff’s Complaint to June 24, 2022 (see Dkt. No. 6);

13 5. WHEREAS, on May 27, 2022, the Honorable District Judge Dale A. Drozd issued an  
14 Order deeming this case related to *Ramos v. Merck & Co., Inc. et al.*, 1:22-cv-00430-DAD-EPG;  
15 *Wylie v. Merck & Co., Inc. et al.*, 2:22-cv-00604-DAD-EPG; *Hobbs v. Merck & Co., Inc. et al.*, 2:22-  
16 cv-00662-DAD-EPG; and *Edwards, et al. v. Merck & Co., Inc. et al.*, 1:22-cv-00433-DAD-EPG  
17 within the meaning of Local Rule 123 and re-assigned the case to Judge Drozd and Magistrate Judge  
18 Grosjean (see Dkt. No. 7);

19 6. WHEREAS Defendants’ motions to dismiss in *Ramos v. Merck & Co., Inc. et al.*,  
20 1:22-cv-00430-DAD-EPG; *Wylie v. Merck & Co., Inc. et al.*, 2:22-cv-00604-DAD-EPG; *Hobbs v.*  
21 *Merck & Co., Inc. et al.*, 2:22-cv-00662-DAD-EPG; and *Edwards, et al. v. Merck & Co., Inc. et al.*,  
22 1:22-cv-00433-DAF-EPG (hereinafter collectively referred to as the “related cases”) are currently  
23 pending and set to be heard on July 5, 2022 (*Wylie*) and July 19, 2022 (*Ramos, Hobbs* and *Edwards*);

24 7. WHEREAS, the Parties agree that, in the interests of efficiency, Defendants’ last day  
25 to answer, move, or otherwise respond to Plaintiff’s Complaint in this case should be extended to a  
26 date after the Court has decided the pending motions to dismiss in the related cases, which is the  
27 reason the Parties have selected July 26, 2022 as the new proposed deadline; and

28 ///



**ORDER**

Having considered the parties' stipulation (ECF No. 8), and in the interest of efficiency and judicial economy, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Defendants shall file their response to Plaintiff's complaint within **fourteen (14) days** of entry of an order resolving the motions to dismiss currently pending in *Ramos v. Merck & Co., Inc. et al.*, 1:22-cv-00430-DAD-EPG; *Wylie v. Merck & Co., Inc. et al.*, 2:22-cv-00604-DAD-EPG; *Hobbs v. Merck & Co., Inc. et al.*, 2:22-cv-00662-DAD-EPG; and *Edwards, et al. v. Merck & Co., Inc. et al.*, 1:22-cv-00433-DAD-EPG;<sup>2</sup> and
2. The Initial Scheduling Conference currently set for September 22, 2022 (*see* ECF No. 4) is VACATED. Within seven (7) days of Defendants' response to the complaint, the parties shall jointly contact Courtroom Deputy Michelle Rooney (mrooney@caed.uscourts.gov) to reset the Initial Scheduling Conference.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **June 22, 2022**

/s/ Eric P. Grogan  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

<sup>2</sup> To the extent separate orders are issued, the fourteen-day deadline shall run from entry of the last order.